

Attachment 3

Minute correction to page eleven, correction of the amended motion. Minutes approved with correction by Planning Commission on September 7, 2006.

Planning Commission Infill Subcommittee and the public. This was an interim situation and not a final fix.

Ms. McBride-Olson commented that one of the primary problems with the Residential Cluster Project was what was happening with properties under five acres. There were land speculators who were going in and maximizing the use on those small lots inappropriately and could do it under the existing Residential Cluster Project. It would take time to completely fix this problem and a quick fix was needed to address this problem and stop the current abuse. She explained that the misuse was allowed under the current Residential Cluster Project and was causing a lot of agony in small neighborhoods.

Bonnie Poulos, member of the Neighborhood Infill Coalition, stated that almost none of the developers use the density bonus under the current Residential Cluster Project because there were too many restrictions. The original intent of what a RCP was supposed to accomplish when this section was added to the *Land Use Code*, was not being addressed by RCP requests for small lots and not being adhered to because the way the code was written. The majority of complaints regarded small properties being redeveloped with no landscaping and inadequate parking and was adversely impacting the smaller neighborhoods.

Discussion continued.

**MOTION** by Ms. Rex, duly seconded, to set for public hearing an amendment to the Residential Cluster Project for projects of less than five acres to require a public hearing by the Zoning Examiner with criteria compliance modeled after the Residential Cluster Project purpose statement.

~~**AMENDED MOTION** by Mr. Williams, to include that the purpose statement applies to all residential projects. Motion died for the lack of a second. Mr. Williams recommended a friendly amendment to the motion to insert the words “to include that the purpose statement applies to all residential projects”. The motion was accepted by the maker of the motion as a friendly amendment, but not by the person seconding the original motion. The friendly amendment would not be included in the main motion.~~

Upon roll call the results were:

Aye: Mr. Hamed, Mr. Holland, Mr. Lurie, Ms. McBride-Olsen, Mr. Patterson, Ms. Przygoda, Ms. Rex, Mr. Williams, Ms. Evans

Nay: None

Absent: Mr. Benavidez, Mr. Patrick, Mr. Thomson, Mr. Wissler

Motion passed by a roll call vote of 9-0.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING: GROVES NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN, PANTANO/ ESCALANTE - PARKING, PA – 06-02**

Note: This item was taken out of order and discussed after Item 2.